TRENDALL (A. D.) and CAMBITOGLOU (A.) **The red-figured vases of Apulia. 1. Early and Middle Apulian. 2. Late Apulian. Indexes.** (Oxford monographs on classical archaeology.) 2 vols in 3. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1978, 1982. Pp. liv+442, 160 plates, 2 figs (incl. 1 map), 1 folding table; pp. xlvi+443–1301, plates 161–400. £25.00; £75.00 (2 vols).

TRENDALL (A. D.) and CAMBITOGLOU (A.) **First supplement to The red-figured vases of Apulia.** (Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies, supp., 42.) London: Institute of Classical Studies. 1983. Pp. xix+252, 40 plates. $25.00.

This monumental publication is of outstanding importance for the study of Magna Graecia and, more generally, of the Classical World before the Roman rule. Thanks to the authors the vast field of Apulian vase painting from its beginning in the third quarter of the fifth century B.C. to its ebbing towards the end of the fourth century has become a minutely mapped-out landscape, an immense task carried through with brilliant scholarship and admirable patience. The wealth of knowledge to be drawn from these volumes will not easily be measured by individual readers.

The core of the book is formed by carefully annotated lists of vases grouped in a roughly chronological order according to oeuvres and workshops. The artistic personalities of individual painters, of the highest as well as of modest quality, are defined, cross connections worked out and possibilities of locating some of the workshops considered. Apulian vase painting is set against a broader historical background (general introduction xlvi ff.). There are a good many admirably concise comments on the subject matter, one of the strong points of Apulian vases, and single motifs of interest are specially dealt with. The highly useful general index (in addition to the special index of mythological subjects) gives an idea of the remarkable range of topics taken up. Besides the index of vases in public and private collections (which amounts to no less than 144 pages) the concordance with *CVA* and several other publications should be gratefully recorded. Important but perhaps easily overlooked are the two well-devised tables setting out the stylistic and chronological relations between the principal painters and workshops (before the plates of vol. 1 and on 1302–3 of the indexes). These tables, a quintessence as it were of at least some of the enormous work which went into both volumes, will prove useful also for the non-specialist reader wanting to inform himself about the rough dating of individual painters and groups.

To some extent the authors maintain their formerly established distinction between two main streams—the Plain and Ornate Styles—though calling the reader's attention to the various zones of overlapping. While both authors had already extensively dealt with Plain Style vases in their *Apulian Red-figured Vases of the Plain Stye* (1961,='*APS*'), they had only started more sporadically on the broad field of the Apulian Ornate Style. It is with the ornate vases, however, those impressive kraters of sometimes monumental dimensions, and with their extraordinary range of subject matter that classical scholarship in general used to find points of contact. This is not the least reason why the equally monumental publication of *RVAp* is now welcomed with the greatest interest.

There are also many new observations on Plain Style painters and vases one had thought fairly familiar. Their development down to the second quarter of the fourth century is traced in chs 3–6. Some modifications of emphasis may be noted by comparing the arrangement of *APS* from some twenty years ago: the Tarporley Painter and his group are now more clearly marked out as key-figures of the early Plain Style at the head of vol. 1, and several painters who had been dealt with separately (although their connection with the Tarporley Painter had been acknowledged) are now seen as followers of this painter (e.g. the Eumenides Group, the Dioskouroi Painter).

Special stress is laid on the interaction of early Apulian and Lucanian vase painting. In the latest phase of the work of the Tarporley Painter at about 385–75 B.C. we meet with what the authors term the TARDOL Group, rather a characteristic blend of Lucanian and Apulian which they now judge to be best placed with the work of the Lucanian Dolon Painter, since the remarkable find of the Dolon and Creusa Painters' kiln at Metaponto in 1973 has contributed to a better understanding of this particular group of vases.

Towards the middle of the century (as well as in several other cases) a similar phenomenon of interaction can be noticed in the context of the Judgement Group (ch. 10, esp. 261). Reluctantly we have to part with the amusing 'Rehearsal Painter' and also with the 'Painter of the London Pelikai', since both seem to represent earlier phases of the Brooklyn-Budapest Painter, who still 'is probably better regarded as a Lucanian than an Apulian and in this respect finds a close parallel in the Dolon Painter' (261; see also Trendall–Cambitoglou, *LCS* Suppl. 3, 67 ff. On the sometimes extremely complicated relationship between Apulian and Lucanian see also *l.c.* 85 f. and *RVAp* Suppl. 1, 30). One cannot help feeling that the no man's land between the earlier phases of both schools is extending to a somewhat disturbing degree and that it might perhaps be wise to leave some of the minor painters just where they are instead of condemning them to repeated shifting between quarters.

The vases of the Ornate as well as those of the Plain Style look back to the 'Pioneers' of the second half of the fifth century B.C. (Sisyphus Group and others). The small oeuvre of the Painter of the Berlin Dancing Girl has been considerably augmented by the find of eight of his vases at Rutigliano in 1976 (see vol. 1 Addenda 433 ff.). A find from Gravina in 1974 brought to light the personality of a formerly unknown important artist, the Gravina Painter, another pioneer of the Proto-Ornate-Style (his remarkable vases with mythological subjects are grouped on pl. 8).

The early ornate vases, many of them of particular interest, are dealt with in ch. 7 starting with the already fairly well known Sarpedon Painter. Full credit is given to the artistic personality of the Black Fury Painter, one of the most talented artists of the decades approaching Middle Apulian, who is responsible, for instance, for the magnificent fragments with the suppliant Priam in the Metropolitan Museum (*RVAp* 7/8; for this painter see also vol. 2 Appendix I, p. 1074!) The slightly less gifted Painter of the Moscow Pelike (169) represents an interesting stage of the development: besides traditional

elements there is a strong foreshadowing of what the more ambitious vases will look like in the next decades of Middle Apulian. With the charming Felton Painter one realizes that at this stage Apulian vase painters manage to keep somewhat more apart from each other than they seem to do in Later Apulian with its intriguing tendency for individual artistic personalities to become blurred.

Closely connected with the work of the Iliupersis Painter—the leading figure of Middle Apulian vase painting—is that of the painter of Athens 1714 whose importance for the development of the Ornate Style had not yet become fully visible about 20 years ago when *APS* was published (where this artist played a far less prominent role among the painters of the Tarporley school). He is now duly recorded as 'affording an excellent illustration of the merging of the two styles—plain and ornate—in the second quarter of the fourth century' (210).

While the later Plain Style tradition is traced in chs 9–12, the last 5 chapters of vol. 1 are devoted to some further key-figures foreshadowing Late Apulian from the second part of the fourth century. They are best represented by the Varrese and Lycurgus Painters. Of special interest is ch. 15, which deals with 'the rise of the baroque style' (looking back to vases discussed in chs 7–8) and for the first time tries to define the artistic personalities of some painters of outstanding quality, as for instance the Suckling–Salting Group and the Group of the Dublin Situlae. The excellent and charming works of painters of this standard seem to make up for the somewhat tiresome output of many minor craftsmen (or sometimes hack copyists) who are responsible for the rather poor reputation Apulian vase painting still enjoys outside the limited circle of specialists.

In vol. 2 the authors admirably succeed in the immense task of tracing the history of Late Apulian with its many intriguing ramifications. More easily recognised are the two main currents of decoration on monumental vases, starting from at least the second quarter of the fourth century: the one shows a marked preference for funerary, so-called naiskos scenes (Gioia del Colle Group, Painter of Copenhagen 4223, Patera and Ganymede Painters), while the painters of the other main stream concentrate on mythological subjects, many of them highly interesting and unusual (Lycurgus Painter and his followers, Darius and Underworld Painters). Others like the Baltimore and White Saccos Painters are more inclined to indulge in both tendencies.

Workshops now tend to become very big, their enormous output especially of smaller vases sometimes bordering on mass production. Collaboration of several painters seems to become the rule. The authors note constant associations between two or more artists, for instance the Patera and Amphorae Painters, Ganymede and Armidale Painters, Baltimore and Stoke-on-Trent Painters. The latter of the two partners is usually responsible for the innumerable isolated heads in secondary representations or on smaller vases. The possibility that the supposed partners are, in fact, one and the same person can—in certain cases—neither be confirmed nor ruled out. The idea of several large workshops working independently of each other (and probably at different places: the Darius and Underworld Circle perhaps at Taranto, the Baltimore–White Saccos Group at or around Canosa)—is unfortunately blurred by the authors' observation that there seem to exist definite links between a few of the secondary representations on vases attributed to different groups (for the links between some vases by the Amphorae and Armidale Painters *cf.* 781 ff. and between others by the Amphorae and Stoke-on-Trent Painters 787 ff.).

To this reviewer one of the major methodological problems in dealing with the stylistic development of Late and Middle Apulian seems to be posed by the activity of various so-called forerunners, who are particularly active around the circle of the Darius Painter (*cf.* ch. 17 sections 3–4 and ch. 18). How can it be explained that artists of remarkable quality like the Painter of Copenhagen 4223 and the Loebbecke Painter (among painters of vases with naiskos scenes) or artists more given to mythological subjects, as for instance the exquisite Hippolyte and Laodameia Painters, tend to be so intriguingly alike in many details of their design? Quite puzzling in this respect are the Painter and Group of the Copenhagen Dancer (508), producing vases which succeed in looking already almost—but not quite—like works by the Darius Painter. Owing to this uniformity (on a fairly high artistic level) it is sometimes extremely difficult to be sure where the oeuvre of one artist ends and that of the next starts, or, for that matter, to define the early work of a given painter. In the first Supplement the authors deal with three important large lekythoi (83 nos. 281a–c) of which the latter two are now in Richmond/Virginia. It is noted that they 'are very close in style to the Darius Painter and provide a good connecting link between him and his follower, the Underworld Painter. They may very well be early works by this painter's hand when he was still strongly under the Darius Painter's influence'. On closer inspection this assumption seems to be correct, and the new lekythoi may be regarded as an instructive test case: when compared with later works by the Underworld Painter, especially his two well-known kraters at Munich, which at first sight look rather different and far less meticulously designed, they nevertheless reveal the limited range of development even in major Late Apulian artists. The persistence of certain dominating formulae of design is striking. Painters working in close collaboration sometimes contented themselves with developing infinitesimal differences which gradually added up to more clearly marked artistic individualities. This is the reason why the earlier lekythoi in Richmond, but not the later kraters in Munich, might be mistaken for works by the Darius Painter's hand.

Apart from the main workshops there were regional sidestreams, for instance the rather curious Ascoli Satriano Painter (718 ff.) who may have been active in northern Apulia (his Paestan connections are recorded as well), or the Lampas Painter, another provincial painter probably working at Canosa, and the possible imitations of Apulian vases found at Melfi (958; 983).

The authors, having to deal with more than 10,000 vases, based their classifications mainly on the work of the painters, and it will be easily understood that for the time being they could not bestow an equal attention to potters. There are, however, interesting remarks on the regional and chronological distribution of shapes: see vol. 1, xlviii ff. with the table indicating use of vase shapes among painters of the Plain style.

It will be felt strongly by the majority of the non-specialists in this particular field of studies that many of

the late Apulian vases, especially those decorated with rather unattractive female heads, may be termed kisses of death. (One should not miss, however, the highly readable introduction to this subject on pp. 646 ff.) From the point of view of development towards abstraction one might even derive mild aesthetic pleasure from the sight of vases like, for instance, those from the Forli Group illustrated on pl. 231, 2–4 and 6. This is of course a far cry from the outstanding oeuvre of the Darius Painter, a clearly dominating figure in Late Apulian vase-painting, which can now be appreciated to a far greater extent than only 25 years ago: in vol. 2 ch. 18 there are 105 vases or fragments attributed to this painter or listed as possibly by his hand, and, most surprisingly, in the first Supplement we find again 15 important new vases formerly unknown which can now be attributed to the painter himself, while several others are classified as closely connected with his style (see also the addition on p. 252).

The amount of important new vases dealt with in this first Supplement (covering only the short time between vol. 2 going to the printers and the end of 1982) is extraordinary. While this review is being written, the authors are already preparing a second supplement. Some of the new material in Suppl. 1 has been yielded by the excavations at several Apulian sites as Canosa, Conversano and Rutigliano, and many more vases have appeared on the European and American market—among the indices there are 10 pages listing vases now or at one time on the market. There can be no doubt that this alarming mobility of Apulian vases is, in a word, wrong. But we are dealing here with an eminent scholarly publication whose authors, reasonably enough, endeavour to make known to the world of classical studies also the interesting objects of illicit traffic, without having to argue about its causes and methods; nor can this review be the forum for any polemics concerning these problems (see on this subject P. E. Arias, *Gnomon* 54, 1982, 167–9).

Substantial additions have been made to the oeuvre-lists not only of the Darius Painter, but also of the Painter of Copenhagen 4223, and the work of the interesting Painter of Louvre MNB 1148 (98 ff.), a contemporary of the Darius Painter, has now become more clearly defined. More than 40 large vases have been newly attributed to the Baltimore Painter. The new material concerning the circle of this painter has led to the identification of a new sub-group linking the Baltimore and White Saccos Painters (147 ff. and 182 ff.). The assumption of such sub-groups, floating in a no man's sea between the islands of non-definite oeuvres with their rather ragged borders are apt to illustrate the at times anti-individualistic character of Apulian vase production.

I add a selection of brief notes on some of the vases dealt with in vol. 2 and Suppl. 1 which are of particular interest for their subject matter. (References to vol. 2 are given by numbers of chapters and individual vases, those to the supplement by page numbers.)

17/60a. The representation of Ganymede carried off by the swan on the neck of this krater with naiskos scene is important in view of the gradual development of sepulcral symbolism. This is still quite a 'normal' mythological (narrative) setting as compared with the Ganymede Painter's name-piece 25/1, but placing the scene on the neck of the vase, above the naiskos, is significant.

18/49 and 50. There are some difficulties to accepting the proposed reading as Zeus and Dionysos setting out for the gigantomachy. One would expect Dionysos to appear as a youth wearing a panther's skin and brandishing a thyrsos as on the new krater by the Underworld Painter in Berlin. The bearded warrior on the gigantomachy fragment in New York *RVAp* 27/31 may be Ares. He is on horseback, however, while the panther-biga on 18/49–50 would be most unusual for Ares. The scene strangely reminds one of the representation of the bearded 'Alexander' on the painter's amphora Naples 3220 (18/47), and the Nike flying towards Zeus recalls one of the motifs of his representations of Hellas. Can 18/49–50 (the latter much repainted with the head of the warrior restored) belong to the group of 'Historienbilder' by the Darius Painter? Are Zeus and Alexander setting out to decide the future of the Hellenic world? This idea might account for the unusual way in which Zeus seems to be confronted here not with an ordinary giant of Apulian breed (with panther skin and on foot), but with a giant-Alexander, as it were. Otto Zwierlein calls my attention to medieval sources which have the dying Alexander declare his intention to join the gods in defeating the giants a second time.

18/67. Besides this unusual fragment (which had been discussed as belonging to an underworld scene in M. Schmidt, 'Orfeo e Orfismo', *Atti del 14. Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia*, 1974, 127, 43) several new underworld vases have come to light: see 23/293; 27/17; 28/87 and Suppl. 1, 152, 23a; for Amphiaraos in the underworld see below 18/75. Several others have been published recently by K. Schauenburg, *RM* 91, 1984, 359 ff. pl. 144 ff. The fragment Amsterdam 2636, *l.c.* 384 pl. 122, 3, however, certainly does not belong to an underworld vase (Schauenburg) but represents the departure of Triptolemos as on the krater Vatican W 4, *RVAp* 15/60, pl. 144, 2.

18/71. This oversize oinochoe shape 8 is one of the most interesting and puzzling new finds. For illustrations see Schauenburg in *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography*, ed. W. G. Moon, Wisconsin Studies in Classics (1983) 266 fig. 17–18a–b. The couple on the panther-biga (the woman holding a crossbar torch) seem to be Dionysos and Persephone or Demeter. Who then is the child? In Apulian vase painting couples in chariots invariably have an erotic connotation. This observation seems to lead to complicated and far-reaching consequences for the interpretation of 18/71.

18/75; *cf.* 27/22a and 23. The identification of the subject on this much discussed fragment should by now have been established as Amphiaraos in the underworld. Schauenburg (*op. cit.* for 18/67) 368 ff. pl. 116, 1–2 has published another krater from this series. His doubts about the Amphiaraos interpretation and his new arguments in favour of Protesilaos did not convince me, especially because the krater at the Hydra Gallery in Geneva clearly refers to a different story (Adonis). The couple on the left of the palace on Schauenburg pl. 116, 1 most probably are not Orpheus and Eurydike (Schauenburg), since the man is bearded and does not wear the Thracian cap, as O. normally does on Late Apulian vases. Both are playing musical instruments—

perhaps a famous couple of poets in the underworld, for instance Sappho and Alkaios?

18/106. The seated god with lyre must be Dionysos, not Apollo; see Schmidt–Trendall–Cambitoglou, *Eine Gruppe apulischer Grabvasen in Basel* (1976) 35, 76.

18/131. The dipinto seems to show that the vase had not been meant in the first place for sepulcral use. See *The Art of South Italy. Vases from Magna Graecia*, ed. M. E. Mayo, Richmond/Viginia 1982, 23 f.

21/145. The young centaur with wreath and branch in the company of a woman with situla and torch is interesting because he seems to have taken the place of one of the more usual Dionysiac youths or satyrs. One may think of the importance of centaurs in the general (probably religious) context of Tarentine terracottas.

22/31. The lost vase, once Naples Dr A. Sbani, had also been illustrated in a drawing and discussed in Séchan, *Etudes sur la tragédie grecque* 144, fig. 45 and by this reviewer in *Praestant Interna* (Studies in Honour of U. Hausmann) Tübingen 1982, 241 fig. 1, where the man led by a boy is identified as Teiresias, probably addressing Oedipus rather than Creon.

27/25 (*cf.* p. 472). Among the very fragmentary vases from Arpi is one showing a beheaded man—most probably another Thersites (now in the store of the Museum at Foggia).

28/87 ff. An important newcomer is the highly original Arpi Painter whose work has become known only by the discovery of a tomb group from Arpinova in Northern Apulia in 1972. The identification of the main scene on 28/88 as the departure of Theseus for Crete, though interesting and tempting, is still open to some doubts. Representations of Theseus are rather unpopular in later Apulian vase painting. Hermes leading the youth away, evidently in the role of Psychopompos, seems to indicate death. The presence of the mourning Eros turning his back on the youth as well as the sadly knitted brow of the latter should be explained in a satisfactory manner. One might think of Protesilaos being released for only a short time from Hades for love's sake. In support of Trendall's suggestion one may however refer to Plut. *Thes.* 18, where Theseus, by command of the Delphic Apollo, chooses Aphrodite as his guide to Crete. The presence of Poseidon also seems to favour this particular sea-trip. For Hermes Psychopompos in Apulia see also Suppl. 1, 170, 59a and especially 173 ff. 86f. For the barrel-amphora in Basel with H. Psychopompos and the interesting dialogue inscription see M. Schmidt and W. Batschelet, *Antike Kunst* 27, 1984, 34 ff. and 41 ff. pls. 8 ff.

Supplement 1: 26 no. 8/35b. This important hydria by the Iliupersis Painter is one of the earlier vases with a scene at a tomb before the time when naiskos scenes became the rule. Six women are bringing offerings of baskets and chests to a monument consisting of an Ionic column crowned by a wool kalathos, evidently the tomb of a woman. *Cf.* the Attic grave monument in the shape of a kalathos and a chest, Athens Nat. Mus. 1052: E. Brümmer *JdI* 100, 1985, 151 ff. fig. 38a.

70 no. 18/11a. The subject of Niobe standing in a tomb monument with the lower part of her body shown in added white to symbolize her (incipient?) petrification has been discussed frequently in recent publications. On this hydria the heroine is not alone in the shrine, but at her side is the figure of a smaller girl in added white. The authors think that the painter might have transferred her from a normal naiskos scene. One wonders whether he wanted to represent her as one of the legitimate owners of the tomb, one of the dead children, the white colour deliberately underlining the contrast with the still living mother. This painter then may have felt and tried to find a solution for the conflict represented by Niobe's intrusion (as a main figure) into the naiskos normally reserved for the dead. The presence of Pelops outside the tomb is another unusual feature. *Cf.* 100 no. 20/278, now published by Trendall in *Occasional Papers on Antiquities* 3, J. P. Getty Museum 1985, 129 ff.

78 no. 18/41a, pl. 12. For this important volute krater by the Darius Painter showing Medea in Eleusis see now Trendall, *Record of the Art Museum Princeton University* 43, 1984, 4 ff. For my suggestion that the children on the altar are not the sons of Medea but of Heracles and Megara see a forthcoming article in *Studien zur Mythologie und Vasenmalerei* (Mayence 1986).

78 and 76, nos. 18/63b–d. It is a great pity that the important new hydriai by the Darius Painter could not be illustrated. His Io hydria (63d) is one of the painter's most charming vases. The deceptively peaceful outdoor scene with the handsome young Argos sleeping on a panther's skin helps to recreate the spirit of the lost contemporary drama *Io* by Chairemon, a poet who, to judge from the extant fragments of his writings, was particularly given to idyllic scenery and to the praise of the beauty of young sleepers. The winged figure beside Argos cannot be a Fury, as the authors suggest—he is male and must be Hypnos. His influence extends to the dog lying fast asleep, a truly humorous portrait of the companion of Argos.

78 no. 64b. This krater has recently reappeared at Sotheby's (June 17, 1985 no. 343). Perhaps not Paris and Helen, but Hippolytos, Phaedra and the Nurse. The lagobolon would be most appropriate for the hunter par excellence, Hippolytos. The gesturing nurse seems a good portrait of the eloquent matchmaker, while the hesitating and introverted bearing of the heroine recalls Phaedra's fight against her passion. For her veiled head *cf.* Eur. *Hipp.* 243 ff. The vase may recall not an actual scene (in Eur. *Hipp.*, for instance, Phaedra and Hippolytos do not meet on the stage) but rather the dramatis personae in characteristic attitudes.

76 and 79, nos. 18/71a–e. There is now an astonishing and still increasing number of dinoi (several of them complete with their stands), a shape which formerly had appeared to be fairly rare in Apulia. They tend to be grouped in series, sometimes of four or more pieces, and their at times unusual subject matter deserves further study. 71d depicts the departure of a young warrior whose local tunic may give a hint to the ethnic identity of the buyers of these vases. Especially interesting for their subjects are 80 nos. 106a–b: Iris before a horned god (Ammon?) and a veiled woman before Apollo. See also 100 f. nos. 278b–c and 252.

83 f. nos. 281a–c. The shape of these large lekythoi had formerly not been represented by actual finds from Apulian sites, though it had been known from representations depicted on vases. For the attribution to the early work of the Underworld Painter see above p. 254. For the shape see also 101 no. 20/278d (=Sotheby's auction sale July 17, 1985, no. 353).

201 no. 30/15a. This volute-krater with the interest-

ing representation of Pegasus in a naiskos has been discussed by Schauenburg, 'Eros im Tempel?' *AA* 1983, 600 ff. with fig. 3 (where, surprisingly, the unusual presence of Eros beside the naiskos has passed without mention). Because of the presence of Pegasus in a naiskos Schauenburg has given up the opinion formerly expressed in *AA* 1977, 285 ff. that Eros as a statue was represented on the amphora in Oldenburg *RVAp* 29/283. If in fact it is the god himself, not his statue, who acts as a symbol of hope for a blissful afterlife, the amphora in Oldenburg can no longer be adduced to prove the existence of an Apulian cult for Eros. Schauenburg's former interpretation had already been refuted by this reviewer in *The Art of South Italy* (cited for 18/131) 31.

MARGOT SCHMIDT

Basel

HUNT COLLECTIONS. **Wealth of the ancient world: the Nelson Bunker Hunt and William Herbert Hunt Collections, Kimbell Art Museum, Fort Worth, etc., 1983.** By D. von Bothmer [and others]. Photography by A. Daneman. Ed. J. Firth Tompkins. [Exhib. cat.] Fort Worth: Kimbell Art Museum. 1983. Pp. 329, numerous illus. (incl. plates (16 col.), text figs, folding maps). Price not stated.

This volume was produced for the exhibition of Greek vases and Greek and Roman bronzes and coins from the Hunt brothers' collections, on show at four American museums in 1983–4. Beautifully designed and illustrated, *Wealth of the Ancient World* is sumptuous proof of the phenomenon discussed in its own opening pages, that while the notable collectors of the past were Europeans, many of today's great collections are to be found on the other side of the Atlantic. This work is of enormous value—for its illustrations of new and important pieces, for its readable and informative descriptions, and for the four wide-ranging essays which introduce and punctuate the catalogue.

The three sections of the catalogue describe and illustrate 15 vases (and 1 terracotta), 38 bronzes and 112 coins. Virtually every item is a star piece. Among the vases, Euphronios' calyx krater with Herakles fighting Kyknos (no. 6) stands out, but so do the uncharacteristically austere and elegant amphora by the Painter of Berlin 1686 (no. 2), the Triptolemos Painter's scene of defecating dog biting man (no. 11), and the remarkable Lucanian calyx krater (no. 14), where Medea leaves the scene of her crime in a snake-drawn car surrounded by a brilliant nimbus. The two outstanding bronzes are the sympathetically-rendered portrait busts, probably of early Imperial date, of an elderly matron and a middle-aged man (nos. 43 and 44). The coins are uniformly spectacular; many are rare, including the gold stater of Pyrrhus of Epirus (no. 105), and the silver denarius issued by Brutus, with reverse type celebrating the assassination of Caesar (no. 119), and one, the gold medallion of Valentinian (no. 165) is said to be unique; among the most impressive are the great decadrachms of Syracuse and Agrigento (nos. 64, 77, 84, 85, and 86).

The catalogue entries, by J. C. Cody (vases and bronzes) and C. C. Lorber (coins) are very good. They are scholarly and well-documented, yet clearly written in a style which should appeal to the general reader and museum visitor as well as to the expert. In addition to accurate, factual descriptions, attempts are made to help the reader appreciate the artistic style, iconography or historical context of each object.

M. E. Mayo's excellent introductory essay places the Hunt brothers and their collection in *their* historical context, with a fascinating and very detailed account of the development of collecting from antiquity (Attalus I of Pergamum, Marcellus, Verres), through the Renaissance and seventeenth- and eighteenth-century cabinets of curiosities, to the rise of the great museums and collections of Europe and America. D. von Bothmer prefaces the vase catalogue with another entertaining and knowledgeable survey of collectors of vases from Hamilton and the Prince de Canino to the great collectors of the twentieth century, including the pioneering Americans Hearst, Hoppin, Gallatin and Robinson. A. Houghton provides a clear and informative survey of the history, development and use of Greek and Roman coinage. Slightly less satisfactory is J. Frel's introduction to the bronzes, which discusses some of the Hunt pieces, but seems to add little to the catalogue entries themselves. The book concludes with a wealth of bibliography, glossary, maps and appendices—especially useful for the non-numismatist are the easily comprehensible accounts of techniques of coin production, die studies, hoards and Greek and Roman weight standards and denominations.

Both writers of exhibition catalogues, and collectors, will be roused to envy and to admiration by this book.

LUCILLA BURN

British Museum

SERVET (J.-M.) **Nomismata: état et origines de la monnaie.** Lyons: Presses Universitaires de Lyon. 1984. Pp. 195, numerous illus. (incl. plates, text figs, 1 map on end paper). Fr. 95.

This dissertation tackles the economic and social aspects of the beginnings of coinage, and the main theme is the inspection of the reasons that lie behind the phenomenon. The coins themselves are more or less ignored in a search that takes the reader through the political and religious institutions of the archaic Greek world, and the discussion would have benefited from a realization that the function of the earliest electrum in Asia Minor and that of the silver in mainland Greece and in Magna Graecia may have been very different. There is no apparent awareness of recent work in numismatics, and there is far too great a reliance on work in French. The somewhat colourful discussions based on material of the fifth century and later are not always fully relevant to the theme. There is, however, some useful material on the function of money in the Greek world drawn mainly from literary sources, and the text is decorated with long quotations in translation, the relevance of which is not always clear.

It is more difficult to pin down what the author believes to be the answer to his main question. It must lie somewhere in the social and political life of the Greek city states. He plays down, rightly, the purely commercial aspects, flirts with the possible role of coins in religious rites, but returns to underline the use of coins